



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2005

No. 105—Book II

Senate

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC-CENTRAL AMERICA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3045) to implement the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 20 minutes evenly divided. Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, is one more failed chapter in a book of trade failures. How deeper must the hole get before we understand we are in trouble? How many more Americans must lose their jobs, with manufacturing, engineering and, yes, more white-collar jobs going overseas, outsourced, before we understand we are in trouble?

We have the largest trade deficit in the history of this country, \$2 billion a day every day, 7 days a week. This is unsustainable. Everybody in this room knows it.

When will we understand that the next trade agreement is one in which we ought to stand up for the economic interests of our country, stand up for the interests of American workers? Let's not be ashamed of believing that our interest is in this country's economic opportunity, supporting our workers, our manufacturers, our farmers. This trade agreement pulls the rug out from under our sugar beet growers, from under our farmers, pulls the rug out from under American workers one more time.

The House passed this bill by two votes last night. There is a 15-minute vote in the House. This one lasted well over an hour, while they were trying to get the rest of the votes. Let me describe what they had to do to get the votes, because this trade agreement is awful. It is bad for the country. It is

going to pile debt on top of debt and make more American jobs disappear overseas. Here is what they said, from today's paper: The last-minute negotiations for Republican votes resembled the wheeling and dealing on a car lot. Republicans who were opposed or undecided were courted during hurried meetings in Capitol hallways, on the House floor, and at the White House. GOP leaders told their rank and file that if they wanted anything, now was the time to ask, lawmakers said, and members took advantage of the opportunity by requesting fundraising appearances by CHENEY and the restoration of the money for their programs. Lawmakers said many of the favors bestowed in exchange for votes will be tucked into the huge energy and highway bills Congress is scheduled to pass this week before leaving for the August recess.

Why do my colleagues think it was necessary to do what they did last night in the House to try to buy these votes with side deals and special deals and keeping the vote open for over an hour? Because this is a terrible agreement, and everybody knows it. When will we have the backbone to stand up for this country's economic interests? What will it take? How many more bad trade agreements? This isn't rocket science. This is our trade deficit. Year after year after year we are drowning in trade debt, and there is not one person on the floor of the Senate who wears a blue suit who is going to lose their job because of a bad trade agreement. It is working folks who lose their jobs, who find out their job left for China because they were making \$11 an hour and the company can hire somebody for 30 cents an hour and work them 15 hours a day, 7 days a week. So the American people lose their jobs.

No politicians are going to lose their jobs. That is why they keep writing bad trade agreements. That is why the country is deeper in debt, the largest

trade deficit in the history of this country. NAFTA, CAFTA, "SHAFTA," GATT, you name it. With every single step we have taken with this trade strategy, the country has gone deeper into debt, and more Americans have found their jobs in peril. When, oh when, will it stop? Apparently not tonight.

Last night they bought CAFTA by two votes in the House. It passed by a slim margin in the Senate. But what this demonstrates to me is this Congress has not yet awakened to the reality of what it is doing to this country. Kids and grandkids wondering about their economic future will find they have less opportunity than their parents did. The one thing we all aspire to have happen always is that we want things better for our kids. We want to leave a place that is better for our children. That is not going to happen with these kinds of trade agreements in which we trade away American jobs, in which we decide that jobs that used to be performed by proud Americans to build products in this country are gone.

There is no social program in this Congress we deal with that is as important as a good job that pays well, with good benefits. That is the way people are able to take care of their families and pursue a career and have the opportunity to expand this great country of ours. Yes, we live in a global economy, we are told. It is a global economy, all right. The global economy has galloped along for the major corporations so they can produce where it is cheap and sell into this marketplace. But it is unsustainable. This won't last. The global economy has galloped along but without rules.

Now a corporation can decide to do business through a mailbox in the Bahamas. It can decide it wants to produce in China or Indonesia or Sri Lanka and hire people for 20 cents an hour and force them to work in unsafe plants. They can hire 12-year-olds to

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S9253

work 12 hours a day and pay them 12 cents an hour. All of that is just fine with this trade strategy.

It is not fine with this Senator. It is not fine at all. Because I understand where it takes this country. We will not long remain a world economic power without a first-class manufacturing capability. And our manufacturing base is shrinking dramatically. Why? Because major corporations have decided they don't want to produce here. Is it because our workers don't do well? Not at all. That is not what it is about. It is about corporate profits by hiring people to work for 30 cents an hour and then selling the product at 30-cents labor to the grocery stores or on the store shelves of Toledo and Fargo and Brainard, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, New York.

I am telling my colleagues, this will not work much longer. Yet this Congress acts completely deaf and blind to the realities of what has come from our recent trade agreements. The North American Free Trade Agreement was one of the last agreements. We had all these economists tell us how many jobs it was going to create in our country. The fact is, our country has lost massive numbers of jobs as a result of the North American Free Trade Agreement. That bad agreement turned a modest trade surplus with Mexico into a huge deficit, and turned a modest deficit with Canada into an even larger deficit. Yet people still say that agreement worked. That is total rubbish.

I hope the Senate will turn down this agreement. I know they have voted for it once before, but now is the time to have some backbone, some nerve, some will to turn down this bad trade agreement.

I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, over the past two decades, Congress has voted again and again to open markets to exports from Central America. In 1983, 392 Members of the House and 90 Members of the Senate voted unilaterally to reduce tariffs on exports from Central America and the Caribbean. In 2000, 309 Members of the House and 77 Senators voted in favor of the Trade and Development Act which further unilaterally opened our markets to products from Central America and the Caribbean.

Today most imports from the region enter our market duty-free. In contrast—and the purpose of this legislation—our exports have faced and continue to face a myriad of tariffs and nontariff trade barriers into that region. Our products going that way, having tariffs and nontariff trade barriers, products coming this way to our country, no barriers. That is the status quo.

In 2005, with the Central American Free Trade Agreement, Congress has

the opportunity to reduce tariff barriers to our exports going to these countries. You can see it is a very unfair situation. If we maintain the status quo, it is unfair to American workers, American manufacturers, the economy of America, because their imports come into our country duty-free. Meanwhile, our exports that go to those countries face tariff barriers of from 3 to 16 percent, some tariffs ranging as high as even 150 percent.

This agreement, finally, after about 20 years of our doing favors in that direction, levels the playing field for American workers, American farmers, and American manufacturers so we can sell our products in these countries.

This agreement takes a one-way street of trade and makes it a two-way street. It tears down unfair barriers to our agricultural exports and gives our farmers a chance to compete in a growing and vibrant market of over 40 million consumers.

A vote against CAFTA is a vote for the status quo. It is a vote to keep import duties duty free, but it also keeps tariff barriers to our export products high. If you vote that way, you are not voting for the American worker, you are not voting for the American farmer, you are not voting for the American manufacturer. You are voting for the status quo.

Well, that status quo is that the United States has been giving and giving for 20 years. This is our opportunity to get, to benefit our workers, to have a level playing field for trade—a two-way street for trade.

I don't see how anybody can justify not leveling the playing field for American exporters. That would end up creating jobs here in America.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Central American Free Trade Agreement ignores American workers, and ignores Central American workers, too. It ignores the labor injustices that still exist in those countries and it turns its back on American workers who continue to struggle to keep their jobs.

It did not have to be this way. We know how to negotiate free trade agreements to improve conditions for workers in other nations and level the playing field for American workers. We have done it before and we can do it again.

These Central American nations are important neighbors and partners to the United States. I have long supported their efforts towards progress since President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. Continuing in that tradition, we owe it to our friends in Central America to ensure that proper labor protections are included and enforced.

The President abused his power and presented Congress and the American people with this take-it-or-leave-it plan, ignoring a strong bipartisan recommendation to assist displaced American workers. Congress had the opportunity to ask the President to meet that responsibility. Instead, partisan back room deals were made and the Re-

publican Congress approved the agreement by a narrow majority in the Senate and a razor-thin majority in the House.

This Central American agreement is not free trade. It does not create a fair playing field for American workers. It fails to address the issues that we hear time and again are so important to them, and it does not deserve to pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me thank Chairman GRASSLEY for the fine work he has done on a very difficult issue. I will start from a different perspective than others might have concerning this agreement.

First of all, I have been leading the opposition to almost every multinational agreement that has come along. I have stood on the floor of the Senate for probably, collectively, 6 or 8 hours talking about how destructive the Kyoto agreement would be should we be a party to it. I have talked about the Law of the Sea Treaty. It was passed out of the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously and was ready for action when we found out what it was. I led the opposition, and we have not passed it yet. We would be losing our sovereignty to the U.N. on a lot of the areas of the sea and the air above it. This is something I have been active in for a long time.

In 1994, I had a very interesting experience. I was in the House of Representatives. I led the opposition to NAFTA at that time. Then I was elected to the Senate in a special election, and it came up in the Senate, and I led the opposition to NAFTA at that time. In Oklahoma, my State, I was the only Member of the House or Senate who opposed NAFTA.

I am here to say that this is not NAFTA. For those who use the argument that NAFTA was wrong and NAFTA should not have worked and, therefore, CAFTA is no good, they just don't know what they are talking about. CAFTA is totally different. I can recall standing on the Senate floor from this very desk saying if we support NAFTA and adopt it, we would have problems—transportation problems—where we would be allowing Mexican truckers to pick up a load in Brownsville, TX, and take it to Oklahoma City and not comply with our wage-an-hour requirements and environmental requirements, and all these things happened; they came true.

That is not what CAFTA is. We have two reasons we need to support CAFTA. One is what the Senator from Iowa talked about—the tariffs. I talked to my farmers, the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, and the Farmers Union, and showed them the tariffs they are paying right now, and what the other side is paying, and this is a win-win situation for our farmers. For example, for grains, we pay 10.6 percent; they pay nothing today; for vegetables, we pay 16.7 percent, they pay nothing; for wood products, we pay 10 percent, they

pay nothing. There is a long list—I can go on and on—of commodities and products where we are penalized and they are not.

Under this bill, we will level that playing field and allow farmers in Oklahoma to be on the same level as those other countries. The other reason—and I think this is very important—is the national security reason. I am ranking member on the Armed Services Committee. I can remember the days in Central America when President Reagan was our President, and then the first President Bush, when we gave freedoms and democracies to all those countries down in Central America.

We remember Daniel Ortega and the activities of the Sandinistas. Right now, we are in a position where we can either punish or reward our friends. These countries with whom we will be in an alliance are our friends. They are supporting us in Iraq and supporting us in everything we do. Those other countries are not supporting us. The Chavezes, the Ortegas, and the Castros are the ones starting to emerge again. Can you imagine, after what we went through with the Sandinistas in the 1980s, and we have Ortega running for President again? I am not about to reward him and give him what he wants, keeping us from having that trade.

If you want to know the kinds of people who are opposing CAFTA, I will read you a few: Earth Justice, Friends of the Earth, EnviroCitizen, Freedom Socialist Party, and the Social Welfare Action Alliance, and others like that.

The conservative groups supporting CAFTA are the American Conservative Union, Americans for Tax Reform, the Heritage Foundation, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Club for Growth, and it goes on and on.

This is an issue where we are on the right side not just for our farmers and for national security and our friends in Central America and South America, but also it is right for America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired but 25 seconds.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield that back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 3045) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Dole	McCain
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Frist	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Brownback	Gregg	Pryor
Bunning	Hagel	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Santorum
Cantwell	Hutchison	Sessions
Carper	Inhofe	Smith
Chafee	Isakson	Specter
Chambliss	Jeffords	Stevens
Coburn	Kyl	Sununu
Cochran	Lieberman	Talent
Coleman	Lincoln	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lott	Warner
DeMint	Lugar	Wyden
DeWine	Martinez	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Dorgan	Mikulski
Baucus	Durbin	Obama
Bayh	Enzi	Reed
Biden	Feingold	Reid
Boxer	Graham	Rockefeller
Burns	Harkin	Salazar
Byrd	Inouye	Sarbanes
Clinton	Johnson	Schumer
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Conrad	Kerry	Snowe
Corzine	Kohl	Stabenow
Craig	Landrieu	Thomas
Crapo	Lautenberg	Thune
Dayton	Leahy	Vitter
Dodd	Levin	

The bill (H.R. 3045) was passed.

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005— CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the conference report on H.R. 6, which the clerk will please report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to bill (H.R. 6), to ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy, have met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the proceedings of the House in the RECORD of July 27, 2005.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 3 hours of debate equally divided.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is obvious that I am two things tonight. First, I am very happy and I am very tired. I do not know which one I am more of, but I am both. I am sure there are many who think differently than I. I hope in the Senate there is an overwhelming number who think as I do. There will be some who do not. But after 6 years of effort in the Senate, and for a time period going back about 15 years, we have not had an energy policy program of any significance for

the United States of America. When I say 6 years, we have been struggling for 6 years to get a current one, and 4 of those years we have produced them and they have failed. I have not been part of all of that, but I left the Budget Committee, the Senate might recall, after many years, with 2 years remaining to be there. That would have made my 30th year on the Budget Committee, and I still would have been chairman. I left it because this would be a nice challenge, and I thought maybe during the 6 years, as chairman of this committee, I might be party to putting together a bill that might do something about America's energy future.

Everybody should know that the Senator from New Mexico knew that we would not do anything for tomorrow, nothing much. We would not have any answers for people who said, what are you going to do tomorrow morning or next week on the gasoline prices? But I did know that we had a chance of doing something that we could come to the floor and say within 5 to 10 years this bill will create jobs, job security, and clean energy.

Now, if that can be done in the complicated maze that we call the energy policy of the United States—and let me repeat, the reason that we can say to Americans that they have more jobs, they will have job security and have cleaner energy being produced, I almost asked, and I will, who could ask for anything more? I think that is a song or something, but who could ask for anything more?

So I start by saying I was very lucky today. I got a call from a reporter for the Albuquerque Tribune. I do not know him very well, but I speak to him occasionally, and I say to my friend from Tennessee, he asked me a neat question. He asked: Senator, people are talking about and maybe nitpicking this bill, and I want to ask you, what do you think things will look like in America with reference to energy 5 to 10 years from now?

That was a terrific question because it permitted me to open my remarks tonight the way I should have over the last couple of months. For once, the Congress is going to do something important from which we as a Nation will benefit, not tomorrow but in the next 5 to 10 years. Certainly, we will begin to feel it in a big way within the next 5 to 10 years. One might say therefore that we could have put most of it off, and we probably would have eked along and would have had some difficult times, but we could have said, it will work out. But what we have done is to make sure that where we have the power, we have done something to make it better.

I repeat, energy is the reason we have jobs. Energy is the reason we have warm homes, electricity, automobiles, everything we look at, humankind-made movement and activity, based on energy use.

That means it is pretty important that we do it somewhat right. Some